



Coo, L. (2018). Rope, robe, shoe or chariot? Sophocles, *Polyxena* fr. 527. *Classical Quarterly*, 68(1), 23-30.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000022>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1017/S0009838818000022](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000022)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) will be available online via Cambridge University Press at <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/classical-quarterly>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Among the remains of Sophocles' *Polyxena*, a tragedy that dealt with the sacrifice of the eponymous princess at the end of the Trojan War, is this enigmatic fragment preserved in Hesychius' *Lexicon* (Hsch. π 652 = Soph. *Polyxena* fr. 527):¹

παράρυμα· Σοφοκλῆς Πολυξένη

παράρυμα ποδός

ὥς κρεμαμένων τινῶν ὑφασμάτων ἐκ τοῦ ἄρματος πρὸς κάλλος. τινὲς δὲ
σχοινίον ἐν ταῖς ναυσίν. οἱ δὲ ὑπόδημα.

παράρυμα¹ Musurus: παραρύμα cod. | παράρυμα² Schrevelius: παρὰ
ρύμα cod. | ἐκ τοῦ ἄρματος: ἐκ δέρματος Sommerstein | ἄρματος: εἴματος
uel ῥάμματος uel ῥύματος Tollius

Side-covering: Sophocles in *Polyxena*: 'A side-covering of the foot', because
of certain woven things hung from the chariot for decoration. Some people
[use it to mean] a rope on ships. And others, a shoe.

¹ Numeration refers to the following editions: A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon, Pars IV: Π-Ψ* (Leipzig, 1935); I.C. Cunningham, *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων* (Berlin and New York, 2003); P.A. Hansen, *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, Volumen III: Π-Σ* (Berlin, 2005); C. Theodoridis, *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon, Volumen III: Ν-Φ* (Berlin and Boston, 2013). Tragic fragments are numbered according to *TrGF*.

Evidence from the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. shows that warships were equipped with sets of παραρύματα, protective screens that were drawn over the sides of the vessel.² The naval lists record two types: λευκά, made of sailcloth, and τρίχινα, made of hide, which shielded the rowers from spray and missiles respectively.³ Given the well-attested meaning of the term παραρύματα, the *Lexicon*'s explanation of the phrase has confounded scholars; Pearson described it as 'the mysterious gloss of Hesychius, of which nothing can be made'.⁴

² Both spellings παραρύματα and παραρρύματα are well attested in the naval records: see L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions, Volume One* (Berlin and New York, 1980), 521. These screens are referred to as παραρρύσεις at Aesch. *Supp.* 715, and as παραβλήματα at Xen. *Hell.* 2.1.22.

³ See C. Torr, *Ancient Ships* (Cambridge, 1894), 52-3; J.S. Morrison and R.T. Williams, *Greek Oared Ships 900-322 B.C.* (Cambridge, 1968), 302; L. Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1971), 249. Although their main function was protection of the vessel, Xenophon records an occasion in 406 B.C. on which Conon employed παραρύματα in order to conceal the presence of the crew from their enemies (*Hell.* 1.6.19).

⁴ A.C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles* (Cambridge, 1917), 2.168. Lucas de Dios writes of the fragment: 'El texto es ambiguo y la fuente lo complica aún más.' (J.M. Lucas de Dios, *Sófocles: Fragmentos* (Madrid, 1983), 266 n. 1005); Sommerstein calls Hesychius' first definition 'mysterious' (A.H. Sommerstein in id., D. Fitzpatrick and T. Talbot, *Sophocles: Selected Fragmentary Plays, Volume I* (Oxford, 2006), 82). Pralon bizarrely translates ἄρματος as 'la lanière de fixation' and concludes 'le glossème ne se distingue ni par sa poésie, ni par sa fonction dramatique...Il paraît simplement relever d'une langage métaphorique, plutôt

The same expression, but without its Sophoclean attribution, is recorded by Photius:

Phot. π 289

παράρυμμα ποδός· τὰ ὑποδήματα τὰ ῥυόμενα τοὺς πόδας.

‘A side-covering of the foot’: the shoes that protect the feet.

A combination of this testimony, the fact that the metaphor ‘a παράρυμμα of the foot’ sounds like it ought to denote a shoe (or at least an item of apparel), and the seemingly nonsensical nature of Hesychius’ reference to a chariot has led most scholars to disregard or emend the latter and to conclude that Sophocles must be describing either footwear or a foot-covering garment. However, if our text is correct, it appears that the *Lexicon* provides three discrete meanings of the single word παράρυμμα, and that the latter two are presented as alternative meanings to Hesychius’ understanding of the use found in *Polyxena*. Only the first definition, where the word is coupled with ποδός, is specified as coming from that play. Had all three glosses been alternative explanations of the Sophoclean expression παράρυμμα ποδός, it is highly likely that the complete phrase would have stood as the lemma, as is the usual practice elsewhere in the *Lexicon*.⁵ This suggests that ‘a shoe’, the third *recherché, voire apprêté.*’ (D. Pralon, ‘La *Polyxène* de Sophocle’, in M. Fartzoff, M. Faudot, E. Geny and M.-R. Guelfucci (edd.), *Reconstruire Troie: Permanence et renaissances d’une cité emblématique* (Besançon, 2009), 187-208, at 203-4).

⁵ This point is missed by F. Ellendt, *Lexicon Sophocleum* (Berlin, 1872²), 602 s.v. παράρυμμα, who takes all three definitions to be confusingly variant explanations of

definition, cannot be the meaning of the Sophoclean phrase as understood by Hesychius. The purpose of this note is thus to evaluate the various definitions of παράρυμα found in Hesychius and, in so doing, to re-assess his credibility as the only testimonium that claims knowledge of the specific meaning of the word *as used* in Sophocles' *Polyxena*.

ROPE

Hesychius' second definition is σχοινίον ἐν ταῖς ναυσίν. The diminutive of σχοῖνος, the term σχοινίον may denote a small rope or cord; in a nautical context, however, it can be used of a regular-size or even a heavy rope, such as a mooring cable. The gloss is of course inaccurate, since παράρυματα were not ropes but screens. This could be the result of confusion at some point with ῥῦμα, one meaning of which is 'towing rope'; it may be relevant that our sole manuscript of Hesychius reads παρὰ ῥύμα in the Sophoclean quotation (where παράρυμα is the correction of Schrevel).⁶ In its nautical sense the word should and does only appear in the plural, since the two sides of a ship necessitate two (or more) sets of παράρυματα.

the Sophoclean phrase, commenting: 'Ex quibus haec hausit lexicī conditor, eos Sophoclis fabulam non amplius legisse integram manifestum est: non potuissent enim dubitare *pes hominis*ne an *navis* intelligendus esset, nec de *instita* et *calceo* ambigere.'

⁶ Alberti's edition reports three conjectures by Toll for Hesychius' ἄρματος: εἴματος, ῥάμματος and ῥύματος, with the explanation of the Sophoclean phrase as 'pars vestis, quae trahebatur'; it is not clear what meaning of ῥῦμα is understood here (J. Alberti, *Hesychii Lexicon, Tomus Secundus*, ed. D. Ruhnken (Leiden, 1766), 868).

Although mention of ships would certainly be apt in a play which dealt with the issue of the Achaean departure from Troy, it seems fairly clear that this section of Hesychius' entry cannot refer to the Sophoclean phrase παραρύμα ποδός but rather to the lemma παράρυμα in its nautical sense, and that the definition has at some point been garbled. The *Lexicon* does include an entry for the plural form at Hsch. π 649 παραρύματα· δέρρεις, although this is assumed to be an interpolation from the Cyril lexicon and is likely to be glossing the specific occurrence of παραρύματα at LXX *Exod.* 35.11, where it is used to translate the word for the curtains of the Tabernacle.⁷

ROBE

Toll conjectured both εἶματος ('garment') and ράμματος ('hem', 'stitching') for ἄρματος: if we accept either, Hesychius' gloss would seem to denote decorative woven material attached to the hem of a garment so that it covered the wearer's feet.⁸

⁷ The Cyril lexicon (as reported by Cunningham (n. 1) from the unpublished edition of A.B. Drachmann), *Synagoge* π 139, Phot. π 290 and *Suda* π 425 all include the entry παραρύματα (παραρρ- Su. G, -μμ- Syn. A, Phot., Su.)· δέρρεις (-ρ- Phot., Su.), σκεπάσματα (om. Cyr. A).

⁸ εἶματος is printed by e.g. W. Dindorf, *Poetae scenici Graeci* (Leipzig and London, 1830), 53 (Ἀποσπασμάτια) and E.A.J. Ahrens, *Sophoclis fragmenta* (Paris, 1844), 280. It is also accepted by Ellendt (n. 5), 602 who believed the object in question to be the trailing hem of a garment. ράμματος is noted with approval by M. Schmidt, *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, Volumen Tertium: A-P* (Jena, 1861), 276, and printed in the text of Hesychius by Hansen (n. 1).

Welcker associated the fragment with another from the same play, *Polyxena* fr. 526 χιτών σ' ἄπειρος, ἐνδυτήριον κακῶν.⁹ This line is thought to come from a prophetic speech - variously assigned by scholars to the ghost of Achilles, Cassandra, or Polyxena - foretelling the murder of Agamemnon, owing to its similarity to the description of the deadly robe used to entrap him at Aesch. *Ag.* 1382-3 ἄπειρον ἀμφίβληστρον...πλοῦτον εἵματος κακόν.¹⁰ There is a strong emphasis in Aeschylus' *Choephoroi* on the fact that this garment was abnormally long, covering Agamemnon's feet: it is referred to by Orestes as πέδας τε χειροῖν καὶ ποδοῖν ξυνωρίδος (*Cho.* 982), νεκροῦ ποδένδυτον | δροίτης κατασκήνωμα (*Cho.* 998-9), and ποδιστῆρας πέπλους (*Cho.* 1000). If fr. 527 also came from a description of this robe, then the metaphor of the παραρύμα could form part of the riddling language in which such prophecies are often cloaked. If correctly quoted in Hesychius, fr. 527 comes from an anapaestic or lyric passage whereas fr. 526 is an iambic trimeter, but these prophetic utterances would not need to come from exactly the same moment in the play.

It is also possible that a different robe is referred to. Greek male dress did not usually reach to the feet, and garments which did so had connotations of effeminacy

⁹ F.G. Welcker, *Die Griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus* (Bonn, 1839-41), 178; see also Ahrens (n. 8), 280.

¹⁰ See Pearson (n. 4), 2.167-8; W.M. Calder, 'A reconstruction of Sophocles' *Polyxena*', *GRBS* 7 (1966), 31-56, at 49 (reprinted in id., *Theatrokratia: Collected Papers on the Politics and Staging of Greco-Roman Tragedy*, ed. R.S. Smith (Hildesheim, Zürich and New York, 2005), 233-66, at 256-7); Sommerstein (n. 4), 81.

and stereotypical Asian luxury.¹¹ It is therefore unlikely that the phrase describes Greek male dress, but it could refer to clothes worn by women or Trojan men, or perhaps to some form of ceremonial dress.¹² Wilamowitz suggested ‘prodit aut Helena aut nuptialis pompa’, comparing Seneca’s *Troades* where Polyxena’s sacrifice is described in nuptial language.¹³ The phrase could have been used of Trojan male clothing: compare Soph. *Troilus* fr. 622 καταρβύλοις χλαίναις, which probably describes the robes worn by a group of Trojan men.¹⁴ A further possibility is a reference to a funeral garment, since a long robe could have sepulchral connotations.¹⁵ In all of these scenarios, however, it is difficult to imagine what the intended effect of the nautical metaphor could have been.

¹¹ For the theme in tragedy, see Aesch. *Edoni* fr. 59 ὅστις χιτῶνας βασσάρας τε Λυδίας | ἔχει ποδήρεις (of Dionysus); Eur. *Bacch.* 833 πέπλοι ποδήρεις (of Maenad dress).

¹² However, the anonymous reviewer for *CQ* suggests that fr. 527 comes from a description of Agamemnon’s royal robes, thus foreshadowing the garment in which he will be killed. If so, his clothing would have been unusual for a Greek man, with the covering of the feet perhaps intended as an orientalizing effect.

¹³ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, ms. ap. S.L. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, Vol. 4: Sophocles* (Göttingen, 1999²), 407. See also J.A. Hartung, *Sophokles’ Werke. Achtes Bändchen: Fragmente* (Leipzig, 1851), 50, who suggests that the fragment refers to the robe worn by Polyxena at her sacrifice.

¹⁴ Sommerstein (n. 4), 242-3.

¹⁵ cf. *Il.* 18.353 ἐς πόδας ἐκ κεφαλῆς (of Patroclus’ funeral garment), and see R. Seaford, ‘The last bath of Agamemnon’, *CQ* 34 (1984), 247-54, at 252.

SHOE

Sommerstein concludes that *Polyxena* fr. 527 must refer to ‘luxurious footwear’,¹⁶ and suggests that it may describe ‘either the royal attire of Agamemnon or the bridal attire of Polyxene the last time she comes on stage’.¹⁷ The metaphor of the παράρυμα could then denote a closed-sided shoe rather than an open-sided sandal (although we might object that, even when describing a single shoe, the plural παράρυματa ought to be used since both sides of the foot are covered). Sommerstein explains away the chariot by conjecturing ἐκ δέρματος for ἐκ τοῦ ἄρματος, suggesting that two pieces of information – i) that some naval παράρυματa were made out of leather, and ii) that the Sophoclean metaphor denoted shoes worn πρὸς κάλλος – have been cobbled together.¹⁸

Elaborate descriptions of footwear are used elsewhere in tragedy to indicate the royalty and/or stereotypical Oriental extravagance of the wearer. Compare the elevated language used by the Persian chorus of Darius’ slipper at Aesch. *Pers.* 660-1 κροκόβαπτον ποδὸς εὐμαριν, or by Agamemnon of his own shoes at Aesch. *Ag.* 945 πρὸδουλον ἔμβασιν ποδός. In Euripides’ *Orestes* the Phrygian eunuch describes both his own foreign footwear (*Or.* 1369-70 βαρβάροις ἐν εὐμάρισιν) and how Helen, depicted in this play as having been corrupted by the luxury of Troy, fled from

¹⁶ Sommerstein (n. 4), 82 .

¹⁷ Sommerstein (n. 4), 75.

¹⁸ This does not, however, take into account the fact that the leather sets of παράρυματa were not woven (ὑφασμάτων), and that the woven (i.e. sailcloth) sets of παράρυματa were not made of leather.

her would-be attackers on golden-sandalled step (*Or.* 1468-9 φυγάδι δὲ ποδὶ τὸ χρυσεοσάμβαλον ἵχνος | ἔφερεν ἔφερεν).¹⁹ It is certainly possible that *Polyxena*, with its Trojan setting, could have drawn attention to a character's shoes in order to emphasise their wealth and/or barbarian nature.

Aside from the testimony of Hesychius and Photius we have no further evidence for παράρυμα(τα) ever being used of footwear, as either a metaphor or a technical term for a specific type.²⁰ The entry at Phot. π 289 certainly refers to fr. 527, but we do not know how Photius obtained his definition. If he did not have access to the original context of the phrase in *Polyxena*, 'shoe' may well have appeared the most plausible meaning.

CHARIOT

Finally we turn to Hesychius' chariot. First, we ought to acknowledge the possibility that the entry is simply a mistake either by the lexicographer himself or the source from which he drew (probably Diogenianus). Such a mistake could perhaps be based on the similarity of the word ῥυμός, 'chariot pole', to the ending -ρυμα. Indeed, the

¹⁹ See also Soph. *Captivae* fr. 44 πατήρ δὲ †χρυσουσδύς† ἀμφίλινα κρούπαλα, which Pearson (n. 4), 1.31-2 suggested might refer to 'the elaborately fashioned shoes of the oriental monarch [i.e. Priam] with their decoration of gold'.

²⁰ Ellendt (n. 5), 602 incorrectly reports Photius' definition of παραρύματα as δέρρεις, ὑποδήματα, an error perhaps prompted by his quotation of Phot. π 289 immediately beforehand. The correct text is δέρρεις, σκεπάσματα (see n. 7). For an exhaustive survey of fifth- and fourth-century Greek terms for footwear, see A.A. Bryant, 'Greek shoes in the Classical period', *HSPh* 10 (1899), 57-102.

next entry immediately after this one reads παραρυμῖς· τὸ παρὰ τὸν ῥυμόν (Hsch. π 653). The word παραρυμῖς here is *hapax legomenon*, but it is not inconceivable that a mix-up of παραρυμῖς and παράρυμα (especially with the latter in its singular form, which is attested only with regard to fr. 527) has at some point led to confusion when glossing the Sophoclean phrase, and that Hesychius either caused or inherited this error.

Otherwise, commentators have struggled to make sense of the text. Campbell understood Hesychius to mean ‘a sort of hammer-cloth’, but suggested that the reference was in fact to footstalls in a chariot, which he identified with the ἀρβύλαι at Eur. *Hipp.* 1189.²¹ Here, Hippolytus is described jumping into his chariot, αὐταῖς ἐν (Valckenaer: αὐταῖσιν codd., αὐταῖσιν cod. unus Etym. Magn.) ἀρβύλαισιν ἀρμόσας πόδας. The word ἀρβύλη normally means ‘boot’, but in this instance, according to the scholia, it denotes a fitting in the chariot floor into which the driver could secure his feet.²² However, doubts have been raised as to the scholiast’s reliability on the grounds that ἀρβύλη nowhere else has this meaning;²³ even if we

²¹ L. Campbell, *Sophocles* (Oxford, 1881), 2.527.

²² The scholiast’s interpretation is accepted by e.g. Bryant (n. 20), 75; W.S. Barrett, *Euripides: Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964), 380; H.A. Harris, ‘The foot-rests in Hippolytus’ chariot’, *CR* 18 (1968), 259-60.

²³ Nonetheless, the alternative explanation of the Euripidean phrase αὐταῖσιν ἀρβύλαισιν – that Hippolytus leaps into his chariot ‘boots and all’ (accepted by e.g. F.A. Paley, *Euripides, with an English Commentary* (London, 1872), 1.233 and LSJ s.v. ἀρβύλη) – is rightly dismissed by Barrett (n. 22), 380 as ‘silly’.

were to accept Campbell's identification, it is hard to imagine why something so mundane as a footstall should merit a fairly elaborate naval metaphor.

Since naval παραρύματα were hung over the sides of the ship to protect the vessel and crew, we might by analogy expect a chariot's παραρύμα ποδός to be material hung over the sides of the vehicle in order to protect the driver's feet (for example, from dust or dirt thrown up by the wheels or the animals' hooves).²⁴ In fact, this fits well with what we know of ancient chariot construction. The high-front chariot, the standard type used in mainland Greece from the seventh century B.C. onwards, did not feature a solid main body but rather rails from which was hung low-level screening material.²⁵ This material reached just above foot-height, and ran round the front and sides of the chariot. It is likely to have been made out of woven textiles or leather latticework, and is sometimes depicted featuring decorative and ornamental detail. Several descriptions of chariots in the *Iliad* suggest woven breastwork of this type.²⁶ The presence of material on the ancient chariot which fits all the elements of

²⁴ We find a protective apron of this kind on a few Cypriot Iron Age terracotta representations of chariots, while some Cypriot stone models of the same period seem to indicate a cloth draped over the siding. See J.H. Crouwel, 'Chariots in Iron Age Cyprus', *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus* (1987), 101-18, at 105, reprinted in M.A. Littauer and J.H. Crouwel, *Selected Writings on Chariots and Other Early Vehicles, Riding and Harness*, ed. P. Raulwing (Leiden, Boston and Cologne, 2002), 141-73, at 150.

²⁵ For this description of the high-front chariot, see J.H. Crouwel, *Chariots and Other Wheeled Vehicles in Iron Age Greece* (Amsterdam, 1992), 30-3.

²⁶ *Il.* 5.727-8, 10.475, 23.335, 23.436. See H.L. Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments* (London, 1950), 326.

Hesychius' description (woven; suspended; decorative; foot-protecting) should thus give us pause before dismissing his opaque testimonium.

Mention of specific chariot components was certainly not below the dignity of the genre of tragedy, even when not conveyed through a metaphor: see for example Aesch. *Sept.* 153 χνόαι ('naves') and the synonymous σύριγγες at Aesch. *Sept.* 205, *Supp.* 181, Soph. *El.* 721 and Eur. *Hipp.* 1234. At Soph. *Epigonoι*, *P.Oxy.* 4807 ii.11-12 we find a catalogue of various chariot parts, including a rail and a βλήτρον (the latter term may refer to breastwork, or to a leather strap or strut).²⁷

Furthermore, the metre of fr. 527 is suggestive. Tragic anapaests most frequently appear in the contexts of processions, religious rituals, lamentation, and the arrival and departure of dramatic characters.²⁸ Sommerstein compares this fragment with Sophocles' *Antigone*, where we find the arrival of characters heralded by short passages of choral anapaests.²⁹ Perhaps in *Polyxena* the grandeur and significance of an arrival or departure by chariot was remarked upon with this instance of nautical imagery. On-stage chariots are often viewed as a hallmark of Aeschylean stagecraft; there are none in extant Sophocles, but this does not rule out his having used them.³⁰

²⁷ See the edition and discussion of C. Mülke, '4807. Sophocles, 'ΕΠΙΓΟΝΟΙ', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 71 (2007), 15-26.

²⁸ S.G. Brown, 'A contextual analysis of tragic meter: the anapest', in J.H. D'Arms and J.W. Eadie (edd.), *Ancient and Modern Essays in Honor of Gerald F. Else* (Ann Arbor, 1977), 45-77.

²⁹ Sommerstein (n. 4), 82.

³⁰ O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1977), 76. Triptolemus' chariot must have played an important role in the eponymous play by Sophocles (cf. the description of it at Soph.

The two obvious candidates among the securely attested *dramatis personae* of this play who would have the status to use such transport are Agamemnon and Menelaus; for reasons that will become apparent shortly, I favour the likelihood of the former.³¹

It is easy to see how the imagery of the παράρυμα would be transferable to this other mode of travel, where the movement of the chariot would have paralleled that of the ship. The use of nautical imagery in relation to motion would be appropriate in a tragedy where the plot revolved around the question of what lengths the Achaean army would go to in order to sail home from Troy. Indeed, we know that nautical metaphors were employed elsewhere in the play: one character bemoans the fact that he must make a judgement where either option will cause dissatisfaction, comparing himself to the helmsman of a ship: οὐ γάρ τις ἂν δύναιτο πρυμνήτης (Diggle: πρῳράτης cod.)³² στρατοῦ | τοῖς πᾶσιν εἶξαι καὶ προσαρκέσαι χάριν (*Polyxena* fr. 524.1-2). On the basis of the speaker then referring to ὁ κρείσσων Ζεὺς ἐμοῦ τυραννίδι (fr. 524.3), the passage is universally accepted by scholars as having been spoken by Agamemnon, perhaps facing the unenviable choice of either

Triptolemus fr. 596), but it may not have appeared onstage; see A.H. Sommerstein and T.H. Talbot, *Sophocles: Selected Fragmentary Plays, Volume II* (Oxford, 2012), 231 n. 59.

³¹ The presence of both Atreidae in this play is attested by Strabo 10.3.14 (= *Polyxena* fr. 522).

³² For J. Diggle's unpublished emendation, see L.M.-L. Coe, 'Sophocles' Trojan fragments: a commentary on selected plays' (Diss., University of Cambridge, 2011), 180-3.

sanctioning human sacrifice or giving up the possibility of returning home.³³ We thus find an existing association in *Polyxena* between Agamemnon and nautical imagery.

To carry the idea even further, if fr. 527 refers to a chariot entry by Agamemnon, such stagecraft could have been a deliberate and significant echo of his striking chariot arrival in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*.³⁴ We have already noted a certain allusion to *Agamemnon* in *Polyxena* fr. 526 (see above), and it is tempting to imagine that Sophocles' play would have explored the parallels between Agamemnon's decision to kill Iphigenia – the event that lies behind the action of Aeschylus' tragedy – and his sacrifice in this play of another innocent young girl, Polyxena. In *Agamemnon* the king enters accompanied by Polyxena's sister, Cassandra, who probably rides with him in his chariot.³⁵ Could he have made a similar entry or exit in *Polyxena*, conveying yet another daughter of Priam to her death? A direct visual

³³ See O.F. Gruppe, *Ariadne: die tragische Kunst der Griechen in ihrer Entwicklung und in ihrem Zusammenhang mit der Volkspoesie* (Berlin, 1834), 595; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, ms. ap. Radt (n. 13), 406; Pearson (n. 4), 2.163; Calder 1966 (n. 10), 46-7 (= Calder 2005 (n. 10), 253-4); Sommerstein (n. 4), 60-1.

³⁴ If Hesychius (or, more probably, his source) was aware that the phrase referred to a specific chariot in *Polyxena*, this might explain why his gloss refers to 'the' chariot (τοῦ ἄρματος) rather than to 'chariots' in general. On the significance of the chariot in *Agamemnon*, see L. Himmelhoch, 'Athena's entrance at *Eumenides* 405 and hippotrophic imagery in Aeschylus's *Oresteia*', *Arethusa* 38 (2005), 263-302, who demonstrates that in this play chariot imagery is associated with 'acts of impiety, brutality, and civic injury, either performed or led by Agamemnon' (280), as well as with aristocratic wealth, tyranny, and nuptial ritual.

³⁵ Taplin (n. 30), 304-6.

allusion to the *Oresteia* would certainly drive home the comparison. Furthermore, the phrase παράρυμα ποδός could have recalled the emphasis on the uncovering and actions of the king's feet in the corresponding Aeschylean scene, where Agamemnon, after dismounting from his chariot, removes the shoes from his Troy-conquering feet and walks barefoot over the tapestries to his death.³⁶

We know that the original text of the *Lexicon* has suffered severe abridgement and interpolation, and it may well be the case that Hesychius' original entry for παράρυμα presented the situation with much greater clarity. It is equally possible that Hesychius was working from confused, inaccurate or incomplete sources, and that none of the discussion above comes close to the original meaning of the Sophoclean phrase. My purpose is not to argue that the 'chariot' interpretation is the correct one, but rather to lay out and assess out a range of possibilities and their implications.³⁷

³⁶ cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 905-7 νῦν δέ μοι, φίλον κάρα, | ἔκβαιν' ἀπήνης τῆσδε, μὴ χαμαὶ τιθεῖς | τὸν σὸν πόδ', ὦναξ, Ἰλίου πορθήτορα, and Agamemnon's description of his shoes as πρόδουλον ἔμβασιν ποδός (*Ag.* 945). See D.B. Levine, 'Acts, metaphors, and powers of feet in Aeschylus's *Oresteia*', *TAPA* 145 (2015), 253-80, who argues for the importance of shod and unshod feet as a strand of meaningful imagery throughout the trilogy.

³⁷ An eloquent statement of this approach to fragments may be found in M. Wright, *The Lost Plays of Greek Tragedy. Volume 1: Neglected Authors* (London and New York, 2016), xxvi: 'Wherever possible, we should try to come up with alternative or multiple interpretations of the fragments. (...) It is up to us how much credulity or scepticism to adopt with regard to the evidence, but we should avoid dogmatism or dogged adherence to any one particular interpretation, for the nature of the material is

This note hopes to have shown that, while it is not implausible that Sophocles' *Polyxena* drew attention to a robe or a shoe, the case for dismissing Hesychius' chariot out of hand as nonsense is less compelling than it might at first appear, and that even a baffling two-word fragment could have the potential to reveal something new about Sophoclean dramatic practice.³⁸

University of Bristol

LYNDSAY COO

l.coo@bristol.ac.uk

such that our conclusions can only ever be tentative or provisional. Rather, we need to be exploratory and open-minded to different possibilities.'

³⁸ This paper develops an argument originally presented in my PhD thesis (Coo (n. 32)). I am grateful to James Diggle for his guidance at the time, and to the anonymous reviewer for *CQ* for their comments on this material.